#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY									
To: HADASSA WATERMAN G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD. 11 MENACHEM BEGIN STREET				PCT WRITTEN OPINION OF THE					
RAMAT GAN, ISRAEL 52 521					ONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY				
					(PCT Rule 43bis.1)				
	•		7	Date of mailing (day/month/year)	0 1 JUL 2008				
Applicant	's or agent's file r	eferençe		FOR FURTHER	ACTION See paragraph 2 below				
	nal application No	).	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)				
PCT/IL06			19 July 2006 (19.07.200						
Internation	nal Patent Classifi	ication (IPC)	or both national classificat	on and IPC	17 741) 2005 (17107.2005)				
	A61B 6/00( 2006 600/436	.01)							
Applicant		-							
SPECTRU	JM DYNAMICS	TTC							
. I. This o	pinion contains i	ndications rel	ating to the following item	3:					
$\boxtimes$	Box No. I	Basis of the	opinion .						
	Box No. II	Priority							
	Box No. III	II Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability							
	Box No. IV	Lack of uni	Lack of unity of invention						
$\boxtimes$	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis, I(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement							
	Box No. VI	Certain doc	Certain documents cited						
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application							
	Box No. VIII	Certain obs	ervations on the internation	al application					
2. FUR	THER ACTIO	N .			·				
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bls(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.									
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.									
	rther options, see				-				
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.									
Name and	mailing address of	of the ISA/US	B Date of complete	ion of this opinion	Authorized officer				
A	Asil Stop PCT, Attn Commissioner for Pa	: ISA/US,	11 June 2008 (1	•	Ruthemith				
P	O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia				1 74 1				
Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201  Thephone No. 571-272-4745									

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

	International application No.	
•	PCT/IL06/00834	

Box No. I Basis of this opinion									
<ol> <li>With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:         <ul> <li>the international application in the language in which it was filed</li> <li>a translation of the international application into, which is the lar international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).</li> </ul> </li> <li>This opinion has been established taking into account the rectification Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))</li> <li>With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in established on the basis of:</li> </ol>	ed anguage of a translation furnished for the purposes of of an obvious mistake authorized by or notified to this								
a. type of material	•								
a sequence listing									
.table(s) related to the sequence listing	·								
b. format of material  on paper  in electronic form									
c. time of filing/furnishing									
contained in the international application as filed.									
filed together with the international application in electronic form									
furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search									
In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subse application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as applicational comments:	equent or additional copies is identical to that in the								
	·								
	·								
	•								
rm POTES P27/Pov No. D. (April 2007)									

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Box No. V) (April 2007)

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL06/00834

ANTERNATIONAL SEARCHING ACTHORITY								
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement								
1. Statement		• •						
Novelty (N)	Claims	Please See Continuation Sheet	YES					
		Please See Continuation Sheet	NO					
Annual transport (fC)	<b>01</b> "							
Inventive step (IS)		Please See Continuation Sheet Please See Continuation Sheet	YES NO					
			YES					
	Claims	Please See Continuation Sheet	NO					
2. Citations and explanations:								
Please See Continuation Sheet		·						
		·						
		•						
		•						
	•							
		· .						
•								
		·						
		•						
	•							
•		·						
·		•						
·								
		•						
		•						
·								
·		•						

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL06/00834

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

#### V.1. Reasoned Statements:

The opinion as to Novelty was positive (Yes) with respect to claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448

The opinion as to Novelty was negative (No) with respect to claims NONE

The opinion as to Inventive Step was positive (Yes) with respect to claims NONE

The epinion as to Inventive Step was negative (NO) with respect to claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448

The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was positive (YES) with respect to claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448

The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was negative(NO) with respect to claims NONE

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

Claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over DeVito et al.

DeVito et al. show a SPECT type of tomographic imaging system. The system can move in relation to the patient (column 6, lines 29-40). The system can accept user inputted commands or data to control the system (column 13, lines 35-67). The system is described for use in a heart perfusion study. The patient is given either a physical or pharmacologic stress. During stress, a radio-pharmaceutical is then administered, and the patient is imaged. After a period of rest, another dose is administered and the patient is imaged again. The images of the stress period and rest period are compared. Such a technique is common and well known in the art for a myocardial perfusion study (column 24, lines 9-50). DeVito et al. further discusses imaging the brain, breast, or limbs.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have imaged other parts of the body. Techniques for imaging other parts of the body are well known in the art, and would be administered to a patient suffering a condition in any other part of the body which would require imaging to evaluate. In addition, the use of a variety of different radiopharmaceuticals could be used in such a system, so long as they allow for the patient to be imaged appropriately. Also, the specific length of times for which the patient should be rested, stressed, and imaged can be different for different patients, and a physician would be able to determine the appropriate length of time. The physician will also be able to determine the appropriate dosage to administer to the patient.

Claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Ryals et al.

Ryals et al. show a method and apparatus for SPECT imaging. Ryals et al. describe SPECT systems which are moved around the area to be imaged, and notes that such systems are well known in the art. Ryals et al. also describe common cardiac perfusion studies, which involve examining the heart under a stress condition and a rest condition. The radionuclide introduced to the heart will follow the blood flow, and perfusion can be determined. Infarct and ischemic areas of the heart can be identified (column 1, line 40-column 2, line 24; also column 8, line 56-column 9, line 15; column 16, line 61-column 17, line 20).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have imaged other parts of the body.

Techniques for imaging other parts of the body are well known in the art, and would be administered to a patient suffering a condition in

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Supplemental Box) (April 2007)

#### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL06/00834

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

any other part of the body which would require imaging to evaluate. In addition, the use of a variety of different radiopharmaceuticals could be used in such a system, so long as they allow for the patient to be imaged appropriately. Also, the specific length of times for which the patient should be rested, stressed, and imaged can be different for different patients, and a physician would be able to determine the appropriate length of time. The physician will also be able to determine the appropriate dosage to administer to the patient.

Claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Bishop et al.

Bishop et al. show a cardiovascular imaging and functional analysis system. The use of such a system for myocardial perfusion studies under stress is discussed ([0077]). The use of different types of radiopharmaceuticals is discussed ([0118]-[0120], [0125]).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have imaged other parts of the body. Techniques for imaging other parts of the body are well known in the art, and would be administered to a patient suffering a condition in any other part of the body which would require imaging to evaluate. In addition, the use of a variety of different radiopharmaceuticals could be used in such a system, so long as they allow for the patient to be imaged appropriately. Also, the specific length of times for which the patient should be rested, stressed, and imaged can be different for different patients, and a physician would be able to determine the appropriate length of time. The physician will also be able to determine the appropriate dosage to administer to the patient.

Claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Supplemental Box) (April 2007)